



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES TO THE J. Q. R., X.

i. *The Duration of the Persian Empire.*

IN my essay on the Great Synod I quoted on p. 355 the following sentence from *Seder Olam Rabba*, c. 30: "All the years of the kings of Media and Persia amounted to 250." Professor Bacher drew my attention to the fact that B. Ratner proved in his edition of the *Seder Olam Rabba* (Wilna, 1897), p. ס"ט, note 15, that the correct reading is not ר"ץ (250), but נ"ב (52). Although this reading seems to be established by the Yalkut to Ezra, § 1068, where we find חמשים ושנים, and by the MS. at Oxford, I yet believe that the reading "250 years" must be preferred. Ratner gives the following detailed calculation:—Cyrus, 3 years; Ahasuerus, 14; Darius, 1; the Persian Empire *before* the building of the second temple (בפני הבית), 34 years;— $3 + 14 + 1 + 34 = 52$ . But this calculation has one fault, namely, that only one year is allotted to Darius, but the books Haggai and Zechariah alone show that the Jews knew also of the *second* year of the reign of Darius. It would be therefore an offence against accredited history to allot to Darius's reign no more than the short span of one to two years. Ratner adduces also as a proof the sentence from *Seder Olam Zuta*: מלכה מלכות יון בשנת נ"ב שנה: למרי פרם. The sentence reads really thus: ובמימי מלכה מלכות יון, "In those days (i.e. in the days of Meshullam, the son of Zerubbabel) the dominion of the Greeks commenced." In the Prague edition of 1795 a full stop follows, and afterwards the sentence: בשנת חמשים, "In the fifty-second year of Media and Persia died Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi." This is the correct division of the sentence, and not the one given by Ratner, who, moreover, knew, but did not accept the division as adopted by me, although the style of the passage distinctly points to it. The commentator Wolf Einhorn (מהר"י) quotes to *Leviticus Rabba*, c. 29, also "52" years, which is not noted by Einhorn—but Einhorn does not take those 52 years to include the whole duration of the Persian Empire, but only for the period during which it flourished (בתוקף מלכותה). It must also be observed that those words בפני הבית cannot mean *before* the building of the temple, but *during the existence* of the temple; this is also noted correctly by Ratner, note 50 (בזמן שהבית קיים). Everything considered, I think the

figure 250, and not 52, to be the correct one. The figure 52 occurs in the Talmud on various occasions to denote certain periods, and this circumstance may have caused the error because the figure was simply copied. See כ"ב in *Aboda Zara*, 9 a (*J. Q. R.*, p. 355, note 1); tradition gives the time between the destruction of Jerusalem and the fall of Bethar as 52 years. This may have occasioned the error as if the war of Quietus (פולמוס של קיטוס) took place 52 years after the war of Vespasian. See Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 413, n. 1.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

## ii. *The Names of Moses.*

L. COHN quotes on p. 288, from *Pseudo-Philonis Antiquitatum biblicarum liber*, Melchiel as a name of Moses, and on p. 391, n. 1, he quotes that name in the form of Μελχίας (accusative Μελχίαν) from Syncellus. In reference to this I venture to observe that I quoted that name some years ago in the form of Μελχί from Clemens Alexandrinus (*JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, V, p. 136). The name Μελχί occurs twice in the apocryphal genealogy of Jesus; see the work *Epiphaniï Monachi et presbyteri de vita sanctissimæ Deiparæ liber* (Rome, 1774), p. 14: Λεὺτὶ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Μελχί καὶ τὸν Πάνθηρα. "Levi begat Melchi and Panthera." The same Melchi occurs in the genealogy of Mary, and also in that of Joseph. The same apocryphal genealogy contains also the name Ἰωακείμ (יהויקים), a name given by Clemens Alexandrinus as the Hebrew name of Moses. This is, at all events, a peculiar coincidence. I further wish to observe that the name Μελχί in the genealogies of Mary and Joseph occurs in the same manner in the note to *Evangelium Matthæi*, at the beginning in the following work: *Codex quatuor evangeliorum... bibliothecæ universitatis Pestiensis* (Pestini, 1860), which contains valuable Greek *scholia*.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

## iii. *The Song of Deborah.*

PERMIT me to supplement the remarks of Dr. Paul Ruben on the Song of Deborah (*JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, X, p. 551).

The view of Budde, endorsed by Dr. Ruben, that verse 14 ends with כִּשְׁרָת, is confirmed by the parallelism, and is doubtless correct. But much confusion has arisen through failure to perceive and firmly maintain the precise force of the noun. The erroneous retention of כִּפְר at the end of the verse, as in the Massoretic text, obviously induced many to fancy that כִּשְׁרָת might actually signify a "pen" or

“reed,” and thus to render שֵׁבֶט כֹּפֶר as “the pen of the writer” (Authorized Version). More careful attention to the established meaning of שֵׁבֶט, however, preserved others from very serious error, though the continued retention of כֹּפֶר still misled them so far as to propose such renderings as “the rod of the scribe,” or “the marshal’s staff.” The removal of כֹּפֶר, now accomplished, is thus the removal of a stumbling-block over which many an able critic has suffered a ludicrous fall.

But we are safely led to further emendation of the preceding context through tenaciously holding to the proper and precise meaning of שֵׁבֶט, which, when it does not signify a “tribe,” means a “rod” of *supreme rule*; hence it is the proper term for the sceptre of a king, the staff of a shepherd (the “uncrowned king” of his flock), or a chastising rod for inflicting punishment on inferiors. When we look further to see what verbs are associated with this noun, when bearing the sense of “sceptre,” it turns out that מָשַׁל sometimes appears in this connexion: see Isaiah xiv. 5; Ezekiel xix. 11, 14. But the most usual sense of this verb is to *exercise supreme rule*—the very meaning required in connexion with שֵׁבֶט, when this noun means a “sceptre,” or rod of supreme rule.

On turning now to the Massoretic text of Judges v. 14, we find the expression מְשָׁלִים בְּשֵׁבֶט. But this is manifestly an exceedingly awkward combination. As the normal sense of the verb מָשַׁל is to “draw out,” ingenious lexicographers and expositors have supposed that the meaning in this passage must rather be to “handle,” or “hold”; this expedient, however, has merely served to accentuate the difficulty of the situation. The simplest and most natural course, however, is to conclude that there has been here an erroneous substitution of מְשָׁלִים for the original and appropriate מְשִׁבִּים (“those who rule supreme”). Such confusion of כ and ל is not infrequent; thus, in Isaiah xvi. 11 לְקִיר was misread by the LXX translator as בְּקִיר (ὡς τεῖχος); and in xxii. 21, כָּאֵב as לָאֵב (ὡς πατήρ). The corrected expression thus means “those who rule supreme with a sceptre.”

See the above argument more fully elaborated in recent *Studies in Hebrew Synonyms*, p. 129.

JAMES KENNEDY.

#### iv. *Sirach*, l. 5–8.

THE picture of the appearance of the high priest Simon, which provided Kalir with the materials for his similes in his description of the high priest in the prayer for the evening service of the day of

atonement, gains some fresh vigour through Dr. Schechter's happy discovery of the original. In l. 5 the word *בהשגיו* need not be corrected, for this "glancing upward" from the tabernacle forms the *tertium comparationis* with the lighting up of the heavenly bodies mentioned in the following lines. The words *בימי מועד*, at the time of the full moon, must, I think, be simply translated, "on the fixed days." Like the full moon on the days when her appearance is expected, thus the countenance of the high priest Simon beamed on the one day in the year when his exit from the holy of holies was looked forward to. This simile of the sun seems to have been spoilt by a fault in the text. As long as no conclusive proofs have been adduced for the Arabic origin of the word *משררת*—and the peculiar words in the newly acquired texts of Sirach, hitherto explained from the Arabic, have all been interpreted in a much more natural way without that hypothesis—we may be allowed to assume that we have to deal with an error of a copyist. The most obvious assumption would be that a *ר* was written instead of a *ק*. The copyist, who was certainly acquainted with Arabic, was induced by an association of ideas to substitute the word *משררת*, a word familiar to him from his own dialect, for *משקרת*. *סקר=שקר*, in the meaning of "looking," "throwing glances," is a term so well-known both in old and modern Hebrew, that it requires no quotations to establish its admissibility. The sun glancing from heaven upon the gilt roof of the royal palace is a simile which appeals with great force to the senses. If we think, with the Greek translator, of the temple of God, which was hardly in the mind of Sirach himself, the figure gains in expressiveness and significance.

It is highly improbable that the poet should have used the expression *בימי מועד* twice within the space of three lines. The Greek translation in verse 6, *ἐν ἡμέραις*, may perhaps be explained as rendering the expression in the sense of fixed days which for this very reason need no further specification; in that case the words *ἐν ἡμέραις νέων* in verse 8 can only be made to correspond with *בימי מועד* by the assumption that the translator had another reading before him. It is not perhaps too far-fetched to think of *בימי נוער*, which also means "in the days of youth," or, in this case, "in the first freshness." *בענפו* must certainly be substituted for *בענפי*, "like the blossom on its branch." The word *ענף* here shows that *נץ* must be taken here as "blossom," and not as "flower." "In the days of the fullness of its sap" is a fitting simile, the correctness of which is established by the parallelism with "the lily in the brooks."

DAVID KAUFMANN.

v. *A Citation by Isaac ben Samuel.*

AMONG the authorities which the Rev. G. Margoliouth cites from Isaac ben Samuel's Commentary to 2 Samuel is a writer indicated by the title of his work as **צאחב אנרון אב ואם** (*J. Q. R.*, X, 400). This writer is none other than Jehuda Ibn Koreish, the originator of comparative Semitic philology. His work, a letter addressed to the community of Fâs (Fez), (on the importance of the study of the Targum, and on the relations between Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of the Mishnah and Aramaic and Arabic), falls into three parts. The third part, devoted to Arabic, is cited by Abraham ibn Ezra in the introduction to his *Môznayim* in the following terms: **כתב ספר וקרא שמו אב ואם**<sup>1</sup>. Isaac ben Samuel, who fulfilled in Egypt the same mission which his younger compatriot, Ibn Ezra, accomplished in Christian Europe, like him spread a knowledge of Spanish exegesis, and like him named **הספררי**, also calls Ibn Koreish's work **אב ואם**, and employs the epithet **אנרון** to imply that the work is a dictionary. For **אנרון**, the title of Saadya's Dictionary, was used in this sense<sup>2</sup>, and we need not assume that it arose from **אנרית** (Arabic **رِسَالَة**) "Letter." It is obvious, at all events, that Ibn Ezra and Isaac ben Samuel are both alluding to the same work of Ibn Koreish, and that they both designate the third and Arabic section of that work as **אב ואם**.

But the passage cited by Isaac ben Samuel does not occur in the *Risâle* (in Barges and Goldberg's edition). The citation (on the words **גוים ואלהין**, left untranslated by the Targum to 2 Sam. vii. 23) must have occurred in another work of Ibn Koreish. Ibn Koreish himself refers to this other work (*Risâle*, p. 43), and states that in the first part of it he had treated of all the words of the Hebrew Bible whose root begins with the letter **א**; his own quotation from it referring to the word **אל** in 1 Sam. xxvii. 10<sup>3</sup>. Quotations from this work of Ibn Koreish are to be found in Menachem ben Saruk and Dunash ben Labrât<sup>4</sup>—all with regard to words beginning with **א**. Menachem calls the book **ספר פתרונים** (*Machbereth*, 12 a, 23 a, 25 b, 35 b)—but this is not its title, but a statement of its contents ("Book of Interpretations"); indeed, Menachem (*Machbereth*, 68 b) cites Saadya's

<sup>1</sup> See my *Abraham Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker*, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Stade's *Zeitschrift*, XVI, 201.

<sup>3</sup> See my works: *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik*, p. 69; and *Die hebräische Sprachwissenschaft vom 10. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert*, p. 22.

<sup>4</sup> See *Die Anfänge*, &c., p. 70.

*Agron* by the same descriptive title. It is therefore most probable that Isaac ben Samuel's citation of Ibn Koreish comes from this same work, of which only the first part (dealing with the first letter of the alphabet) was completed. Under the word אלהים, Ibn Koreish must have entered the note on the omission of the Targum to translate יגיים ואלהין.<sup>1</sup> We cannot tell whether Isaac ben Samuel actually possessed Ibn Koreish's work or only knew it from quotations.

W. BACHER.

<sup>1</sup> David Kimchi also gives an explanation of this circumstance. On another untranslated passage in the Targum to 2 Sam. i. 9, see my note in the *Z. D. M. G.*, XXVIII, 39.